

Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002002

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above reference application are respectfully requested.

Appellant herewith exercises option 1 and files a Rule 1.111 reply to this nonfinal office action.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Malec, et al.. Claims 3, 4, 6, 9 stand rejected as being obvious over Malec, et al.. With all due respect, this contention is respectfully traversed, and it is respectfully suggested that the rejection does not meet the patent office's burden of providing a prima facie showing of unpatentability.

Claim 1 recites a base storage and control system with a processor, display element, wireless transceiver, and as well recites a portable I/O device where the portable input output system also includes a wireless receiver user interface, and arrangement for providing a continually displayed full-screen display received in bursts. The rejection alleges that all of these are shown in Malec, et al. Most specifically, the rejection alleges that column 10 and figures 13-14 show the burst control. With all due respect, the system shown in column 10 is a very different system than that defined according to

Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002002

claim 1.

Note specifically that Malec, et al. teaches a system where the content of the transmissions can be stored within the mobile computer. Column 10 lines 14-column 11 line 22 describe the way that the data is sent. The header is tested, and then the device 514 checks the message number and message version against the stored messages see column 11 lines 1-4. If there is a match between an incoming message and a stored message, then the SCD can turn off and go to sleep to save battery life during the remainder of that data frame. Since it knows how long the frame will last, it can go to sleep for a time until the next new frame. Therefore, the data can be received at some times and not received at others -- but those times depend on whether the SCD already has the data or not. Malec, et al. teaches that the data is continuously transmitted.

Claim 1 is entirely different; it states that the base storage and control system produces an output signal "said output signal being produced in bursts, with delays between the bursts, during which delays no information is transmitted" (emphasis added). Note that Malec, et al. specifically states that "the SMT 503 is continuously transmitting to refresh the messages stored in the parts". (Column 10, lines 4-5, emphasis added). That is, Malec, et al. teaches that the transmission is continuous, not in bursts as required by claim 1. Therefore,

Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002002

claim 1 is not anticipated by Malec, et al., which requires the transmission being in bursts. For this reason, the rejection based on section 102 is incorrect, and claim 1 is completely patentable over Malec, et al.

The claims which depend from claim 1 should be allowable for analogous reasons.

Claim 4 specifies that the output display signal is one of a video signal, a video sync signal or others. The official notice has been taken that the signals such as video, video sync, and the like are known. However, nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion of wirelessly transmitting these signals. Conventionally, these signals have been produced internal to the device to drive the display. Claim 4, which defines wirelessly transmitting these signals, is further patentable thereover.

The rejection of claim 9 continues to be respectfully traversed. Initially, the undersigned fails to understand the reference to Tymes and Auer in the rejection of claim 9. The rejection of claim 9 was based on Malec, et al. Malec, et al. does not teach a directional coupler. As explained previously in the prosecution, and specifically in the appeal brief, directional couplers have been used in various systems, but not in a wireless transceiver of the specific type claimed. With all due respect, the rejection based on official notice is ineffective to show the use of a directional coupler in a

Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002002

wireless system of the type claimed.

New claim 22 is also provided herein, and even further distinguishes over the Malec, et al. prior art. Malec, et al. teaches, as described above, transmitting continuously, but receiving in bursts, when the portable computer device already has the same information stored therein. Claim 22 defines transmitting in bursts, see above, and also receiving in bursts when the full-screen display "differs from a previously received full-screen display". Thus, claim 22 further distinguishes over Malec, et al., which receives in bursts only when the information that is being transmitted is precisely identical to that information that it has previously received. Therefore, claim 22 should be even further allowable for these reasons.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability

Attorney's Docket No.: 07326-002002

of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply any additional claim fees and any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050. It is believed no extension of time fee is required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

8/10/05

Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 678-5070 telephone
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10540824.doc